

In the United States Court of Federal Claims

OFFICE OF SPECIAL MASTERS

No. 20-1475V

UNPUBLISHED

MICHAEL MENDOZA, Guardian ad
Litem of C.M., a minor,

Petitioner,

v.

SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND
HUMAN SERVICES,

Respondent.

Chief Special Master Corcoran

Filed: April 2, 2021

Special Processing Unit (SPU);
Ruling on Entitlement; Concession;
Table Injury; Influenza (Flu) Vaccine;
Guillain-Barre Syndrome (GBS)

Alan Kenneth Nicolette, Nordstrom, Steele, et al., Tustin, CA, for Petitioner.

Matthew Murphy, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington, DC, for Respondent.

RULING ON ENTITLEMENT¹

On October 26, 2020, Michael Mendoza filed a petition for compensation under the National Vaccine Injury Compensation Program, 42 U.S.C. §300aa-10, *et seq.*² (the “Vaccine Act”), on behalf of C.M. Petitioner alleges that C.M. suffered Guillain-Barré Syndrome (“GBS”) which meets the Table definition for GBS after receiving the influenza vaccine on September 6, 2019. Petition at 1, ¶¶ 2, 40. Petitioner further alleges that C.M. received the vaccine in the United States and that neither he nor any other party has received compensation or filed a civil action for C.M.’s GBS. *Id.* at ¶¶ 2, 43-44. The case was assigned to the Special Processing Unit of the Office of Special Masters.

¹ Because this unpublished ruling contains a reasoned explanation for the action in this case, I am required to post it on the United States Court of Federal Claims’ website in accordance with the E-Government Act of 2002. 44 U.S.C. § 3501 note (2012) (Federal Management and Promotion of Electronic Government Services). **This means the ruling will be available to anyone with access to the internet.** In accordance with Vaccine Rule 18(b), Petitioner has 14 days to identify and move to redact medical or other information, the disclosure of which would constitute an unwarranted invasion of privacy. If, upon review, I agree that the identified material fits within this definition, I will redact such material from public access.

² National Childhood Vaccine Injury Act of 1986, Pub. L. No. 99-660, 100 Stat. 3755. Hereinafter, for ease of citation, all “§” references to the Vaccine Act will be to the pertinent subparagraph of 42 U.S.C. § 300aa (2012).

On March 29, 2021, Respondent filed his Rule 4(c) report in which he concedes that Petitioner is entitled to compensation in this case. Respondent's Rule 4(c) Report at 1. Specifically, Respondent concluded "that [P]etitioner has satisfied the criteria set forth in the Vaccine Injury Table ("Table") and the Qualifications and Aids to interpretation("QAI")." *Id.* at 4.

In view of Respondent's position and the evidence of record, I find that Petitioner is entitled to compensation.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Brian H. Corcoran

Brian H. Corcoran
Chief Special Master